

REMARKS

Claims 9-13 and 21-26 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 21, 24 and 25 are amended and claim 19 is canceled. Reconsideration of the application in light of the foregoing claim amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank Examiner Nguyen for the courtesy extended to Applicants' representative, Mr. Luo, during the May 5, 2005, personal interview. The substance of the interview is incorporated in the following remarks, which constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; and (c) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,415,439 to Randell et al. (hereinafter "Randell"). This rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claim 19.

The Office Action rejects claims 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Randell in view of U.S. Patent 5,923,318 to Zhai et al. (hereinafter "Zhai"), and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,311,175 to Waldman (hereinafter "Waldman"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the personal interview, Randell, Zhai and Waldman do not disclose or suggest a second morpheme input converting a normally triggered first default action to a second action, the second action based on the first default action, as recited in claims 21 and 25.

In particular, as discussed during the interview, although Waldman discloses a dual-press protocol and a multi-press protocol at col. 5, lines 56-64, the dual-press protocol (or multi-press protocol) merely defines an input that will trigger an action which is different and independent from an action triggered by an input defined by a counterpart single-press of a key/button.

For example, Waldman discloses a two-level keypad system wherein the first (touch) subsystem (singular-pressing) responds to an information manipulation of a key, and a subsequent second (press) subsystem (dual-pressing) responds to a functional manipulation of the same key. See col. 2, lines 37-41. Here, the action of performing the functional manipulation of the key, defined by the dual-pressing of the key, is independent, and, therefore, is not based on the action of performing information manipulation of the key, defined by the singular-pressing of the key.

Specifically, a user may directly use the second (press) subsystem, without using the first (touch) subsystem, so as to directly perform the action of functional manipulation, defined by the dual-pressing of the key, without triggering the action of performing the informational manipulation, defined by the dual-pressing of the key. Thus, the action of performing the functional manipulation, defined by the dual-pressing of the key, is not based on the action of performing the informational manipulation, defined by the singular-pressing of the key.

For at least the above reasons, Randell, Zhai and Waldman do not disclose or suggest a second morpheme input converting the normally triggered first default action to a second action, the second action based on the first default action, as recited in claims 21 and 25.

Furthermore, as discussed during the interview, Randell, Zhai and Waldman do not disclose or suggest triggering a first default action by the device, in response only to the orienting of the deformable piece relative to an external environment object, as recited in claim 24.

As discussed during the personal interview, Randell does not disclose or suggest orienting an object. The portions of Randell that were cited in the Office Action merely disclose "squeezing" and "covering a part of" a doll. See col. 7, lines 21-37. Thus, Randell does not disclose or suggest triggering a first default action in response only to the orienting of the deformable piece relative to the external environment object.

As discussed during the interview, although Zhai discloses "positioning" a sixth-degree freedom mouse, such a positioning is not an input, because a subsequent "squeeze" is required to activate a switch to input data. See col. 5, lines 28-30. Zhai does not disclose that the positioning, alone, activates the switch to input data. Thus, Zhai does not disclose or suggest triggering a first default action in response only to the orienting of the deformable piece relative to the external environment object.

For at least the above reasons, Randell, Zhai and Waldman do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 21, 24 and 25, and claims 9-13, 22, 23 and 26 depending therefrom. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-13 and 21-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 9-13 and 21-26 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GXL/jth

Date: May 9, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
